

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP

315 S. Beverly Drive, Suite 210
Beverly Hills, California 90212

Telephone: (310) 556-7983
Facsimile: (310) 556-7984

FAX COVER SHEET

PLEASE DELIVER THIS FACSIMILE TO EXAMINER S.R. PANNALA

TO: Commissioner for Patents
Attn: Examiner S.R. Pannala
Group Art Unit 2177
Patent Examining Corps
Facsimile Center
Washington, D.C. 20231

FROM: David W. Victor

OUR REF: 0054.0032
TELEPHONE: 310-556-7983

Total pages, including cover letter: 3

PTO FAX NUMBER 1-703-746-7758

If you do NOT receive all of the pages, please telephone us at 310/556-7983, or fax us at 310/556-7984.

Title of Document Transmitted: INFORMAL COMMUNICATION - DO NOT ENTER
INTO PROSECUTION RECORD: AGENDA FOR
PHONE INTERVIEW

Applicant: N.R. Eisenberg et al.
Serial No.: 09/579,866
Filed: May 25, 2000
Group Art Unit: 2177
Docket No.: STL920000058US2

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on
August 10, 2004

By: 
Name: David Victor

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	N.R. Eisenberg et al.	Examiner:	S.R. Pannala
Serial No.:	09/579,866	Group Art Unit:	2177
Filed:	May 25, 2000	Docket No.:	STL920000058US2
TITLE:	METHOD OF, SYSTEM FOR, AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR STORING, RETRIEVING, & USING REMOTE HOST FILE ATTRIBUTES ON A LOCAL FILE SYSTEM		

INFORMAL COMMUNICATION -
DO NOT ENTER INTO PROSECUTION RECORD:
AGENDA FOR PHONE INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

A phone interview is scheduled for August 11, 2004 at 2:00 PM (EST) to discuss the rejection in the above case. Applicants submit this agenda for the scheduled phone interview.

In the non-final Office Action dated April 19, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Xu (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,581) in view of Schmuck (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,841).

Applicants want to discuss why claims 1, 7, and 13 are patentable over the cited art. In particular:

Applicants want to discuss why the cited col. 8, lines 47-59 of Xu does not teach or suggest the claim requirement of determining a subset of the foreign file attributes which are equivalent to a corresponding subset of file attributes of the native file system, the subset of the foreign file attributes hereinafter known as conventional file attributes.

Applicants want to discuss why the cited col. 8 line 65 to col. 9, line 6 of Xu does not teach or suggest the claim requirement of returning the conventional file attributes to the client.

Serial No. 09/579,866
Docket No. STL920000058US2
Firm No. 0054.0032

Applicants want to discuss why the cited col. 10, lines 43-53 of Schmuck does not teach or suggest the claim requirement of storing a remaining subset of the foreign file attributes which are not equivalent to a corresponding subset of file attributes of the native file system, the remaining subset of the foreign file attributes hereinafter known as extended file attributes and the other claim requirements concerning the remaining subject of the foreign file attributes.

If further discussion is needed after discussing the independent claims, Applicants would like to discuss the patentability of certain of the dependent claims. In particular:

Applicants want to discuss why the additional requirements of claims 3, 9, and 15, dependent from claims 1, 7, and 13, are patentable over the cited Xu.

Applicants want to discuss why the additional requirements of claims 4, 10, and 16, dependent from claims 1, 7, and 13, are patentable over the cited Schmuck.

Applicants want to discuss why the additional requirements of claims 6, 12, and 18, dependent from claims 1, 7, and 13, are patentable over the cited Schmuck.

Dated: August 10, 2004

By: 

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984